Exhibit I

PRUETZ LAW GROUP LLP
Adrian M. Pruetz (Bar No. CA 118215/ampruetz@pruetzlaw.com)
Erica J. Pruetz (Bar No. CA 227712/ejpruetz@pruetzlaw.com)
200 N. Sepulveda Blvd., Suite 1525
El Segundo, CA 90245
Telephone: (310) 765-7650 / Facsimile: (310) 765-7641

LEE TRAN & LIANG APLC
Enoch H. Liang (Bar No. CA 212324/ehl@ltlcounsel.com)
Steven R. Hansen (Bar No. CA 198401/srh@ltlcounsel.com)
Edward S. Quon (Bar No. CA 214197/eq@ltlcounsel.com)
601 S. Figueroa Street, Suite 4025
Los Angeles, CA 90017
Telephone: (213) 612-3737 / Facsimile: (213) 612-3773

Attorneys for Plaintiff
NETLIST, INC.

Timothy T. Scott (SBN 126971/tscott@kslaw.com)
KING & SPALDING LLP
333 Twin Dolphin Drive, Suite 400
Redwood Shores, CA 94065
Telephone: (650) 590-0700 / Facsimile: (650) 590-1900

Scott T. Weingaertner (*pro hac vice*/sweingaertner@kslaw.com)
Robert F. Perry (rperry@kslaw.com)
Allison Altersohn (*pro hac vice*/aaltersohn@kslaw.com)
Daniel Miller (*pro hac vice*/dmiller@kslaw.com)
KING & SPALDING LLP
1185 Avenue of the Americas
New York, NY 10036-4003
Telephone: (212) 556-2100 / Facsimile: (212) 556-2222

Attorneys for Defendant
GOOGLE INC.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

OAKLAND DIVISION

NETLIST, INC.,

Plaintiff,

v.

GOOGLE INC.,

Defendant.

CASE NO. CV-09-05718 SBA
[Related to Case No. CV-08-04144 SBA]

JOINT CLAIM CONSTRUCTION AND PREHEARING STATEMENT UNDER PATENT LOCAL RULE 4-3

Pursuant to Patent L.R. 4-3 of the Local Rules of Practice for Patent Cases before the United States District Court for the Northern District of California, Plaintiff Netlist, Inc. ("Netlist") and Defendant Google Inc. ("Google"), by and through their respective undersigned counsel, submit the following Joint Claim Construction and Prehearing Statement ("Joint Statement").

I. Construction Of Claim Terms On Which The Parties Agree (Patent L.R. 4-3(a))

The chart attached as Exhibit A to this Joint Statement lists the constructions of the claim terms and clauses of U.S. Patent No. 7,619,912 ("the '912 Patent") on which the parties agree. The agreed to constructions for the claim terms "logic element," "signal," and "control signals" were construed by the Court in related case *Google Inc. v. Netlist, Inc.*, CV-08-04144 SBA ("the '386 Patent Case"). In addition, the parties have agreed to constructions previously stipulated to from the '386 Patent Case for the claim terms "memory devices," "coupled to the printed circuit board," "rank," "command signal," and "chip-select signal." The parties have also agreed to the constructions of the claim terms and clauses "computer system," "phase-lock loop device," "mounted to the printed circuit board," and "register."

II. Proposed Construction Of The Disputed Terms (Patent L.R. 4-3(b-c))

The chart attached as Exhibit B to this Joint Statement lists the constructions of the claim terms and clauses of the '912 Patent whose constructions the parties dispute, as well as each party's proposed constructions and supporting evidence, in accordance with Patent L.R. 4-3(b).

For purposes of Patent L.R. 4-3(c), Netlist contends that the five most significant terms in dispute are (1) "bank," (2) "the at least one integrated circuit element comprising a logic element, a register, and a phase lock loop," (3) "operatively coupled/operationally coupled," (4) "spaced from," and (5) "in a direction along the first side/in a direction along the second side."

For purposes of Patent L.R. 4-3(c), Google contends that the five most significant terms in disputed are (1) "set of input control signals" / "set of input signal" / "plurality of input control signals," (2) "set of output control signals" / "set of output signals" / "plurality of output signals," (3) "at a time," (4) "bank," and (5) claim 45 (indefiniteness).

III. Length Of Time For Claim Construction Hearing (Patent L.R. 4-3(d))

The tutorial and claim construction hearing are presently scheduled for September 9, 2010 beginning at 9 a.m. Pursuant to Judge Armstrong's Patent Standing Order, the tutorial is scheduled to last approximately one to one-and-a-half hours, with each side being allotted 30-45 minutes to present a short summary and explanation of the technology at issue.

Google Proposal for the Tutorial: Due to the parties' previous tutorial to the Court on similar technology in the '386 Patent Case, Google does not believe that a live tutorial is necessary. Google proposes that, prior to the claim construction hearing, the parties submit a written tutorial to the Court.

Joint Proposal for the Claim Construction Hearing: Pursuant to the Patent Standing Order, the claim construction hearing will normally be scheduled to last no longer than three (3) hours. Due to the parties' previous tutorials to the Court on similar technology in the '386 Patent Case, the parties believe that three (3) hours would be sufficient and appropriate for the hearing.

The parties will meet and confer on an appropriate manner of presentation for the hearing and will submit a joint proposal to the Court.

IV. Witnesses To Be Called At Claim Construction Hearing (Patent L.R. 4-3(e))

The parties identify the following witnesses to be called at the claim construction hearing.

A. Witness Netlist May Call

Netlist anticipates that it may call Richard Turley as a witness at the tutorial and claim construction hearing. Mr. Turley would be expected to explain how a person of skill in the art would interpret the claim terms at issue. Mr. Turley may also testify regarding the relevant technology at issue in this case.

B. Witness Google May Call

Google does not believe any witnesses are required; nevertheless Google reserves the right to call William Hoffman as a witness at the tutorial and claim construction hearing. Mr. Hoffman would be expected to explain how a person of skill in the art would interpret the claim terms at issue. Mr. Hoffman may also testify regarding the relevant technology at issue in this case.

DATED: June 25, 2010

LEE, TRAN & LIANG, APLC

By /s/ Steven R. Hansen
Steven R. Hansen

Attorneys for Plaintiff
NETLIST, INC.

DATED: June 25, 2010

KING & SPALDING LLP

By /s/ Scott T. Weingaertner
Scott T. Weingaertner

Attorneys for Defendant
GOOGLE INC.

DECLARATION OF CONSENT

Pursuant to General Order No. 45, Section X(B) regarding signatures, I attest under penalty of perjury that concurrence in the filing of this document has been obtained from Scott T. Weingaertner, counsel for Defendant Google Inc.

DATED: June 25, 2010

LEE, TRAN & LIANG, APLC

By /s/ Steven R. Hansen
Steven R. Hansen

Attorneys for Plaintiff
NETLIST, INC.

Exhibit A to Joint Claim Construction and Prehearing Statement under Patent L.R. 4-3

EXHIBIT A, *Netlist v. Google,* Patent Local Rule 4-3(a)

logic element	"a hardware circuit that performs a predefined function on input signals from the computer system and presents the resulting signals as its output."
signal	"a varying electrical impulse that conveys information from one point to another."
control signals	"signals, including address and command signals, that regulate system operations."
memory devices	"devices in which data is stored and retrieved."
coupled to the printed circuit board	"electrically connected to the printed circuit board."
rank	"a group of memory devices enabled to receive and transmit data by a common chip-select signal."
command signal	"a signal that initiates a predetermined type of computer operation, such as read, write, refresh or precharge."
chip-select signal	"a control signal that enables the input and output of data to and/or from a memory device."
computer system	"a server or personal computer system including a set of hardware components that are related and connected and to which a memory module is connectable"
phase-lock loop device	"a device for generating a clock signal that is related to the phase of an input reference signal"
mounted to the printed circuit board	"attached to the printed circuit board"
register	"a circuit component or components that receive, buffer, and transmit signals"